

REMARKS

Applicant affirms the election of Group 1, claims 1-19 and 22-31 made provisionally by telephone on April 2, 2003. Claims 20 and 21 have been withdrawn by the Examiner.

Claims 1-7, 9-14, 16-19, 23-24 and 26-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneier et al (US Patent No. 5,970,143) in view of Newton's Telecom Dictionary's definition of PCMCIA (hereafter referred to as "NTD PCMCIA").

Claim 1 is hereby amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention by claiming that the processor module includes the main processor. Claim 1 claims a dumb electronic gaming unit. The dumb electronic gaming unit was defined in the specification on page 8, lines 19-23 as not having a resident main processor. The main processor controls the operation of the gaming unit and runs game programs. In accordance with the invention, the main processor is included in the plug-in processor module.

Schneier et al does not teach the use of a dumb gaming unit which does not have a resident main processor. Schneier et al discloses a gaming unit that has a resident main processor (27, shown in Fig. 4A). Schneier et al teaches the use of plug-in modules, such as an encryption/decryption module 28 which may include another processor (see 302 in Fig. 4C), however the main processor 27 resides in the gaming unit.

The NTD PCMCIA reference describes a PCMCIA card which may include a modem, memory, LAN connections, etc. but does not teach a PCMCIA card having a main processor for plugging into a dumb electronic gaming unit as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, claim 1 as amended, is patentable over the combination of Schneier et al. and NTD PCMCIA. Claims 2-7 and 9-11, depending from claim 1, are therefore also patentable.

Claims 8, 15 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneier et al. in view of NTD PCMCIA and in further view of the article "A Simple Wireless Computer Connection For Home, Office or School" (hereafter "WL PCMCIA"). More particularly, it was stated in the Office Action that WL PCMCIA discloses that the PCMCIA card can have wireless features. It was stated in the Office Action that it would

have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate wireless features of WL PCMCIA into the gaming system of Schneier and NTD PCMCIA in order to allow the player the flexibility to move around as the player plays the game. However, even the three way combination proposed in the Office Action neither teaches nor discloses a dumb electronic gaming unit with a PCMCIA card having a main processor for plugging into the unit as recited in claim 8. Therefore, claim 8 is also in condition for allowance over the art of record.

Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneier et al in view of NTD PCMCIA. Claim 12 is hereby amended to claim a dumb electronic gaming unit and a processor module removably connected to the dumb gaming unit, the module containing the main processor. The combination of Schneier et al and NTD PCMCIA does not teach or suggest the use of a dumb electronic gaming unit as defined in the claims and a processor module containing the main processor which is removably connected to the gaming unit. Therefore, claim 12 is patentable over the cited references of Schneier et al and NTD PCMCIA. Further claims 13, 14 and 16-19 depend from patentable claim 12 and are therefore also patentable for the same reasons.

Claim 15 was rejected as being unpatentable over Schneier et al. in view of NTD PCMCIA and WL PCMCIA. For the same reasons as outlined above in connection with claim 8, it is believed that claim 15 also patentably defines over the applied art as well as the remaining art of record.

Claim 22 was also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneier et al in view of NTD PCMCIA. Claim 22 is hereby amended to claim a plurality of dumb hand-held units and a plurality of plug-in processor modules each including a main processor for controlling the operation of the dumb hand-held unit and running a game play program during game play. Claim 22 as amended is patentable over the cited references for the same reasons as amended claims 1 and 12. Further claims 23, 24 and 26-31 which depend from patentable claim 22, are also patentable.

Claim 25 was rejected as being unpatentable over Schneier et al. in view of NTD PCMCIA and WL PCMCIA. For the same reasons as detailed above in connection with claim 8, it is respectfully submitted that claim 25 also patentably defines over the applied combination as well as the remaining art of record.

Accordingly, prompt and favorable examination of all the pending claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN,
MINNICH & McKEE, LLP

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Jay F. Moldovanyi", written over a horizontal line.

Jay F. Moldovanyi
Reg. No. 29,678
1100 Superior Avenue, 7th Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-2579
(216) 861-5582

L:/PDF/DATA/ARW/20174/AMENDMENT